



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT BOSTON, MASS.

BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD EDITOR.

DO THE AMERICANS HATE ENGLAND?

It is much to be regretted that Mr. Simon Hanauer, of the Frankfort Peace Society, has seen fit to make and publish in *Die Waffen Nieder* the following statement as to the feeling in the United States toward England:

"Of all the wars which the future of the American Union may bring, none would be more popular in the United States than a war with England. For every American child studies with enthusiasm the glorious history of its own country and thence derives a hatred against England, which, although slumbering, grows with the child's growth, and may be compared to the feeling which the Carthaginians cherished against Rome."

It is quite as much to be regretted that Mr. Hanauer's statement has got into the English peace papers and is being circulated by them, sometimes with comment sometimes without, as if it were substantially true. The correctness of it, if not openly declared, is at least supported by the fact that Mr. Hanauer "has resided many years in the United States" and is therefore assumed to know whereof he affirms. The sweeping character of the statement ought to have put our English friends on their guard against accepting it without many grains of allowance. One may live many years in some part of a country which is 3000 miles by 2500 miles in extent and yet know but little about the general sentiment of its people. One section of a country as large as the United States often differs very much in sentiment from other sections, and this fact ought to make one careful about generalizing what he may have seen in one locality into a universal judgment about the whole country.

Without reflecting in the least on the honesty of intention of Mr. Hanauer whom we, personally, know to be an excellent man and a genuine friend of peace, we are constrained to say without reserve that his statement, in the form in which it is put, could scarcely be farther from the truth. Think of it! The hatred of England which the American children imbibe in the study of "the glorious history of their country" growing with their growth until it becomes like the Carthaginian hatred of Rome! One can almost imagine, as he reads such a statement, the Atlantic covered with American galleys all pushing their angry beaks straight for the detested mother-country, or a thousand little western Hannibals led by their British-hating papas to some altar and there swearing eternal vengeance against their hereditary foe.

There is, we are sorry to have to say, too much dislike of the English among our citizens, just as there is too much of the same thing in England toward us. This is the legacy which the two wars of 1776 and 1812 have

left us and of which we shall not get entirely rid for a long time to come. It affects us unconsciously even in spite of efforts to throw it off. But the state of feeling between the two countries is gradually, one might almost say rapidly, changing for the better. As to the United States three things are incontestable. Instead of it being true, as Mr. Hanauer says, that dislike of England grows with the children as they grow, the exact opposite is true. You may sometimes hear a twelve-year-old who has just got through his first reading of our early national history loudly declaring that he would like to help "thrash" England; even this is not at all common. But the little "patriots," who for the moment are living over again the scenes of '76, largely outgrow this as they come to maturity and learn that the England of to-day is very different from that of the times of George the Third.

In the second place, it is a noteworthy fact that in those parts of the country where the dislike of England might be supposed to linger longest and be most deeply rooted, it has most nearly disappeared. At Boston and Philadelphia and the other cities of the East, where the memorials of the revolution are the most numerous, England is respected and trusted and honored as she is nowhere else in the land. But this feeling is becoming more and more general in the country among all the better classes of our population, and the other classes think and care little about it. While making this statement, we would not disguise the attitude of a considerable number of editors and politicians who are ready to make capital out of the least untoward event and to try to frighten our people into believing that England with her big fleet is secretly planning to fall upon us at no distant day. But the power of these is growing continually less, and it is wholly within bounds to say that the great majority of the American people would look upon a war with England as the most deplorable thing that could befall us.

This leads us, in the last place, to say that the people of this country are, with increasing seriousness, disposed to look upon the United States and Great Britain as "two nations but one people," whose great general interests are one and the same, whose destinies are interlocked, who are foremost in creating for the world what in the future is to be the law of the peaceful adjustment of international difficulties. We would not overlook nor minimize the unfortunate dislikes existing between them, but we would be the last to magnify and exaggerate them or to wish to see others do so. Our peace cause will be glorious enough in its triumph without having to conquer fancied evils.

EDUCATION IN BRUTALITY.

The extract from a Philadelphia paper which we give on another page calls attention to a subject of much greater importance than at first seems. The evil of bill posting, as a source of education in brutality and crimes of vio-

lence, is even greater than it is as a source of licentiousness. Public sentiment, though yet much too weak and indifferent, is sufficiently strong in many cities to keep the posting-boards fairly free from unclean pictures, at least in the more open and public places. Why should it not be strong and discerning enough to prevent the display of bills representing the most brutal and dastardly deeds of violence?

This evil of the show-bills is not confined to the city of Philadelphia, nor indeed to cities of any size or location. In Boston, with all its refinement and education, there are nearly always some of these brutal pictures in sight, as any one may convince himself to be true by keeping his eyes open while riding the length of Washington street. Men with wild, angry faces standing with uplifted dagger ready to plunge it into the heart of a woman on her knees near him, or with pistol drawn and flashing its smoke and powder into the face of some enemy, or standing with club in hand over a victim of his wrath who lies crushed on the ground,—these are samples of what may be seen every day posted up in conspicuous places in our American cities. They ought not to be permitted. Municipal and State laws ought to make such things impossible. The very commonness of such pictures seems, however, to render the better classes of society heedless to their mischievous influences. They see them, cast a hasty glance at them, turn away and go about their business, perhaps not appreciably affected themselves for evil. They forget that another class of people daily feasts its eyes on these representations of violence,—a class whose animal instincts are deeply corrupted and over whom such exhibitions of fancied brutality have an irresistible and deadly charm. It is the duty of all those who are seeking the peace and good order of society through the purification of its morals to take away such incentives to evil from the eyes of the vicious classes. Otherwise we shall continue to perpetuate the folly of dosing the effect, by means of fine and imprisonment, while ignoring one of the powerful causes of the brutal crimes so prevalent in many quarters.

The bill introduced into the Pennsylvania legislature to stop the posting of such pictures ought to pass without an hour's delay, though it will certainly not. Legislators reason like other people that such things have always existed, therefore they always will, and so let them alone. Meanwhile the education of boys and men into roughs and desperadoes will go on in these "free public institutes," while lawmakers sleep.

Closely allied to this evil is another which is even more to be condemned, because it comes from a source from which we have a right to expect something different. We refer to the manner in which great dailies give detailed accounts of the brutal prize fights now so common. It is not long since the most widely circulated and read of New England dailies devoted two columns of its front page on two successive days to a graphic description of two

prize fights, illuminating the account with pictures of the sluggers. This reference to a New England paper is only made because it is nearer home. Other great dailies do the same. They justify their action on the ground that it is "news," and that great dailies must get and publish the news. We admit that there is some truth in this claim. As long as such brutal and disgraceful things exist, we ought to know it. But this claim of the necessity of giving the news is a pitiable justification of the habit of putting the account of these fights in the most prominent part of the papers, as if they were among the great events of the day, like the Home Rule question or the annexation of Hawaii or the selection of a new cabinet, or of the way in which they detail the manner in which the sluggers pound each others faces into a jelly or knock each other senseless.

It is likewise an unworthy shirking of responsibility to say that the people demand these accounts and that everybody reads them. It is nearly impossible not to read them, the way they are put into prominent places and flamingly headlined. Many people glance at them or read them in part or in whole who would be greatly pleased if they were not thus thrust into their faces. But the serious responsibility connected with their publication in this retailed and graphic way lies in the fact that they fire and inflame the passions of great numbers of people who ought not to read a syllable about them. Are we to believe that a great daily, which ought to be and claims to be a leader of public thought and public morals, is privileged to pander to the lower inclinations of society? How are we to account for the fact that these long graphic accounts are rarely if ever accompanied by an editorial condemning prize fighting, though there is no lack of editorial criticism on many subjects? Valuable as it is to get and publish the news, is that the highest plane on which a great daily is to live? It may be doubted whether a single subscriber or a single reader would be lost by the reduction of these accounts to the small limits which they ought to have, especially in a paper which keeps itself full of the great and important events of the day, and public sentiment, of the better classes, ought to make itself speedily heard in opposition to this newspaper education in brutality.

THE PEACE CONGRESS AT CHICAGO.

The Fifth Universal Peace Congress, to be held under the auspices of the World's Congress Auxiliary of the World's Columbian Exposition, will be held in the Permanent Memorial Art Palace, Chicago, beginning on the 14th of August and continuing one week. About ten sessions in all will be held. The closing session of the Congress will be a Sunday morning service in the Art Palace, in which the religious and moral aspects of the Peace Movement will be considered.

The Congress promises to be one of the largest and